DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 681 HE 002 078

AUTHOR Stier, William F., Jr.
TITLE An Investigation and Evaluation of Faculty Workloads, with Specific Emphasis upon the Physical Education Departments of Selected Small Liberal Arts Institutions of Higher Learning.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty, Faculty, *Higher Education, Noninstructional Responsibility, *Physical Education, *Teaching Load, Working Hours

ABSTRACT

It is the thesis of this paper that many factors must be taken into consideration to determine faculty workloads and that the weights placed upon the various factors are of importance equal to the actual factors themselves. The first section reviews available literature on faculty workloads, and lists: (1) some of the questions asked in these investigations; (2) time spent by 75 faculty members at Southern Illinois University at 12 different activities related to their work; and (3) 19 factors that should be considered in determining faculty workload. The second section considers the purpose and results of a questionnaire that was sent to directors of physical education departments at 15 small 4-year liberal arts colleges in the Midwest. Ten responded to questions concerning: (1) policy regulating faculty workload; (2) factors involved in determining faculty workload; (3) compensation received for coaching responsibilities; (4) average hours of teaching load; (5) average time spent by department chairman in various duties; (6) factors considered a part of an individual physical education faculty member's total responsibility that are assumed in addition to regular teaching assignments, along with the compensation for these responsibilities. (AF)

ED049681

AN INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY WORKLOADS, WITH SPECIFIC EMPHASIS UPON THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS OF SELECTED SMALL LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING.

By:

William F. Stier, Jr.
Chairman: Health Science, Physical Education and Recreation
Briar Cliff College
Sioux City, Iowa 51104

HE002078

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Review of Available Literature	3
Purpose and Procedure of the Investigation	11
Findings of the Investigation	12
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Table I	20
Table II	21
Table III	23
Table IV	24
Table V	26

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, there have been two basic methods employed in considering instructional needs in respect to and in light of faculty workload. The first is concerned primarily with the numbers of hours required in order to teach any given course--otherwise referred to as the "contact hour method." The second method considers the number of student credit hours produced and has been designated the "productivity method."[1]

The reasoning behind the utilization of the "contact method" is that an equal of energy and preparation is required to teach any given course regardless of how many students enroll. Granted that the correction of papers and tests, etc., may be slightly more time-consuming for larger classes. Contrast this philosophy with that held by the Board of Regents for the State of Kansas in which the productivity method has been adapted in respect to making decisions regarding institutional needs and faculty workload. This method of viewing faculty workload indicates a concern only with advancing students toward a degree. Thus, if a large number of students make adequate progress toward the degree by means of a specific course, then the teaching of that course was indeed productive. However, if the instructional effort is instrumental in assisting only a relatively few students advance or progress toward the ultimate end, a degree; the effort is to be considered insufficient. It would seem that the productivity method might be instrumental in the discouragement of any course offering which might attract only a small

---

[1]Donald P. Hoyt, "Staffing at Kansas State University" (Office of Educational Research, Manhattan,Kansas, 1969), p. 7.

enrollment. Such a policy, as adhered to by the Kansas Regents, supports only those educational programs which can be provided with reasonable efficiency and economy; terms which have a specific connotation in light of the philosophy of the "productive method." Research would indicate that there are a multitude of factors which may be taken into consideration in determining faculty workload. The degree of emphasis or weight placed upon the various factors are of equal importance as the actual factors themselves.

REVIEW OF AVAILABLE LITERATURE

Many specific factors have been utilized in measuring faculty load, such as: contact hours, student advisers, committee memberships, and scholarly tasks. Knowles and White propose that education take a lesson from industry in this matter of evaluating the teaching job by attacking the problems of faculty loads with the tools of modern management rather than in terms of traditional educational terminology. Specifically they suggest that if an evaluation of faculty service load is to be meaningful then it must be based upon a separate analysis of the various components which taken together compose the work done by a faculty member.[2] Gleaning of numerous studies indicates a pattern of inquiry in that the following questions are of utmost concern to the investigators:

1. How much service, or time, should a college expect of a staff member?
2. What is considered a teaching load?
3. Does size of class have influence on service load?
4. Are extra class activities, such as membership on committees, advisers, directors of activities, and conference periods counted as service loads?
5. How are service loads of supervisory and administrative personnel determined?
6. How many weeks are counted in service loads for faculty?
7. To what extent should persons be paid additional salary for extra required service?[3]

One must take into consideration the entire spectrum of factors which may cause extensive variation in actual teaching loads as well as recognize the fact that there exists great difficulty involved in measuring such

---

[2]Asa S. Knowles and W. C. White, "Evaluation of Faculty Loads in Institutions of Higher Learning," Journal of Engineering Education, 29:798-810; 1939.

[3]John D. Messick, "Teaching and Service Loads of College and University Staffs," School and Society, LXIX (May 7, 1949), pp. 335-26.

factors. Richards concludes from his scanning of a study which was conducted in 1937 in an attempt to survey the teaching loads in 57 representative North Central institutions, that a more accurate measure of teaching loads might be the ratio of out-of-class work to class or contact hours instead of the measure which concerns itself with either credit-hours or contact hours.[4]

Numerous studies have dealt with specific institutions or groups of institutions demonstrating inter-institutional cooperation in this regard and a brief review of these will be presented below. When an institution is attempting to effect an evaluation or measurement of faculty load, it is wise to be fully aware of the two most common purposes for so doing: (1) to acquire adequate faculty, and (2) to divide responsibility among faculty.[5]

A report of a conference sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, New England Board for Higher Education, and the Office of Statistical Information and Research of the American Council on Education was reported by Burnell to include:

1. An overview which suggests the importance of faculty workload studies
2. A discussion of the sociology of faculty workload, and an attempt to define the term
3. Reprots concerning methods and techniques for measuring faculty workload
4. Reports on the uses of faculty workload data
5. A discussion of the dynamics of faculty load studies
6. A survey of the literature concerning faculty load, together with a bibliography.[6]

---

[4]C. F. Richards, "Toward the Equalization of Teaching Loads," Journal of Higher Education, XXI (January, 1950), pp. 39-41.

[5]Dale L. Bolton, "Measuring Faculty Load," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 13, (S, 1965), pp. 157-8.

[6]Kevin Bunnell, editor, Faculty Work Load: A Conference Report, Washington, D.C. : American Council on Education, 1960.

Probably one of the most comprehensive studies on the internal affairs of institutions is a report by the California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study in which two measures of teaching costs were utilized: (1) teaching-salary expenditure for weekly student-class-hour, and (2) teaching-salary expenditure per student credit hour.[7] Drews also included a description of methods used and results of a faculty load study with an analysis of all activities, by rank by individual college or school, and budgetary support. Data is also provided in respect to the cost of such activities, by both rank and college or school.[8]

Randolph presented an extensive study of the average number of hours per week spent by a sample of seventy-five Southern Illinois University faculty members on twelve different kinds of activities. The findings are presented in form of a list of activities together with the average hours per person per week. These findings may be summarized:

a. hours in class - 14.6
b. preparation in class - 12.2
c. conferences with students - 4.4
d. faculty meetings and committee work - 2.2
e. office work - 4.6
f. oral exams - 0.2
g. research - 4.9
h. field work and public relations - 0.9
i. travel to extension classes - 0.5
j. professional readings - 3.2
k. attending regional meetings - 0.0
l. other - 3.9

total -51.6[9]

---

[7]California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study, "Instruction," Fund for the Advancement of Education, Chapter II, pp. 9-31, 1960.

[8]Theodore N. Drews, "The Professional Activities of the Teaching Staff, Fall Term, 1964-65," Office of Instructional Research, University of Michigan, October, 1965, p. 55.

[9]Victor Randolph, "The Professor's Weekly Work Hours," School and Society, LXXII (September 23, 1950), pp. 201-02.

The University of Minnesota was the focus of two studies dealing with faculty workload. The first, reported by Eckert, consisted of a questionnaire type research endeavor into such areas as, teaching load by number of courses taught, number of credit hours taught, number of students per course, level of courses taught, number of classroom hours, and hours of class preparation. Responses were also solicited in respect to time spent in individual counseling; number of other campus activities, and time spent; number of off-campus related activities and time spent; membership in professional organizations and time spent.[10] The second study by Keller and Abernathy summarized the services of 1,299 full-time faculty members.

Faculty activities which were included in this investigation included: classroom teaching, non-scheduled and individualized instruction, counseling, and advising, research, administrative responsibilities, committee work, consultative services, and others. The investigation included an analysis of tabulations by rank and by school or college.[11] Similarily, New York University was studied by Russell who made a complete analysis of the academic program which included the scope of the institutional's course offerings, size of classes, teaching loads of faculty members, the student credit-hour, production, and the instructional salary

---

[10]Ruth E. Eckert, "The University Faculty Load Study," Studies in Higher Education, Biennial Report of the Committee on Educational Research, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1942, pp. 1-31.

[11]Robert J. Keller and Margaret G. Abernathy, The 1950-51 Survey of Faculty Activities at The University of Minnesota, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1951.

costs.[12]

Silvey investigated instructional load in selected midwest colleges and for the purposes of this study the terms "instructional activities" interpreted as those activities involving direct instructional contact with the student. Administrative and other non-instructional duties were excluded.[13] Other studies which might be of interest to the reader include Jackson's investigation of teaching loads for various types of institutions and student-staff ratios;[14] Bagley's study in which the investigator described basic concepts in approaching faculty load studies;[15] and Coffelt who studied student-credit-hour cost at institutions in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education;[16] and Hobbs' questionnaire study of twenty-five liberal arts colleges in which were studied such factors as class size, amount of time devoted to preparation, laboratory supervision, student conferences, committee work, other special assignments (as in music and physical education), research, research supervision,

---

[12]John Dale Russell, Director (Office of Institutional Research, New York University, Washington Square, New York, New York), Report on Current Institutional Research, Office of Statistical Information and Research American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., No. 6, July 16, 1958.

[13]H.M.Silvey, "Instructional Load--A Cooperative Survey of Instructional Load in 39 Midwest Colleges in Eleven States," Bureau of Research and Examination Services, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1959.

[14]Melbourne L. Jackson, "A Survey of Faculty Teaching Loads in Chemical Engineering," Journal of Engineering Education, 41:552-554, May, 1951.

[15]Clarence H. Bagley, editor, "Faculty Load Studies," Design and Method in Institutional Research, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York, May 3-4, 1965, pp. 1-5.

[16]John J. Coffelt, Faculty Teaching Load and Student Credit Hour Costs in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, 1964-65, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Box 53383, State Capital Station, Oklahoma City, Okla., 1966, pp. 1-109

administrative duties and consultation.[17]

Research into faculty workload is not limited to four year institutions but is found in two year colleges as well. Instructor Workload Charactersitics was the subject of an investigation by Cohen who reviewed all assignments (teaching, extra-curricular and "assigned").[18]

Stordahl at Northern MIchigan University, reported that the total workweek was estimated to be about sixty hours which included time spent in conjunction with twelve possible professional activities.[19] A study which not only attempted to determine the present status as to faculty workload but also to conduct a costs and profitability analysis of the tabulated findings was that of Perch at Manhattan College in New York.[20]

There are seemingly endless studies as such -- similar to that conducted by Sawhan in that an attempt is made to determine the present status of faculty workload at a particular institution.[21]

Table I includes a chart indicating the percentages of positive

---

[17]M.T. Hobbs, "Teaching Loads in Selected Arts Colleges," Liberal Education, Vol. 52, 1966, pp. 418-21, Washington D.C., Association of American Colleges, Inc.

[18]Irwing Cohen, BMCC Instructor Work Load Characteristics: Fall 1967, Office of Institutional Research, Borough of Manhattan Community College, 134 West 51 Street, New York, N. Y. 10020, 1968, 12P.

[19]Kalmer Stordahl, Faculty Workload, Office of Institutional Research, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Mich. 49855, 1968, 12 p.

[20]James T. Perch, A Cost and Profitability Analysis, Office of Institutional Research, Manhattan College, New York, N.Y. 10471, 1969, 32 p.

[21]Gerald L. Shawhan, Survey of Instructional Loads, University of Cincinnati, Autumn Quarter 1967-68, Director of Institutional Studies, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45221, 1968, 23 p.

response relating to load weighting practices which were determined by Ray Gray in his regional and national investigations concerning faculty load weighting.[22] This investigation by Gray was limited specifically to the load weighting practices utilized by physical education departments for men in selected colleges and universities.

A specific set of guidelines for assigning college faculty loads in departments of physical education is presented by Sheets at West Chester State College in Penna.[23] Table II provides an actual guide for faculty load assignments while Table III provides the average workload for the faculty from the fall of 1967 to the spring of 1969 as revealed by Sheets. Table IV describes specific duties involving other than teaching responsibilities and how these factors are taken into consideration at West Chester State College.

Table V is an actual report from a small liberal arts institution utilized in determining an attempt at weighing not only those strict teaching duties but also taking into account other responsibilities such as coaching, intramurals, and committees as well as many others.

The American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, in its Professional Preparation Report issued in 1962, recommended that the following factors be taken into consideration when determining faculty workload in the physical education department:[24,25]

---

[22]Roy Gray, "Trends in Faculty-Load Weighting," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXXI (September 1970), pp. 38-39.

[23]Norman L. Sheets, "Guidelines for Assigning College Faculty Loads," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXXI (September 1970), pp. 40-43.

[24]Professional Preparation in Health Education, Physical Education and Recreation Education: Report of a National Conference (American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation: Washington, D.C., 1962), p.57.

[25]Graduate Study in Health Education, Physical Education, and Recreation Report of the National Conference on Graduate Study in Health Education, Physical Education, and Recreation, Pere Marquette State Park, Illinois (Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1950) p. 19.

a. time needed for preparation
b. type of courses taught
c. direction of theses and other student writing
d. administration
e. offices held in professional organizations
f. committee work
g. conduct of discussion groups
h. counseling with students
i. the direction of independent study
j. research under way
k. preparation of comprehensive examinations
l. consultant service
m. extension teaching
n. intramural and coaching duties
o. extra-curricular duties

It is further recommended that each faculty member should be determined by the following criteria:[26]

a. the number of different preparations per week
b. the number of students for which he is responsible
c. the nonteaching responsibilities which he has
d. the amount of personal attention which each assignment requires

---

[26]Adapted from Evaluation Standards and Guide in Health Education, Physical Education, Recreation Education, p. 16.

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURE OF THE INVESTIGATION

For the purposes of this investigation into the topic of faculty workloads it was determined to construct a questionnaire and conduct a survey type investigation of physical education departments in colleges deemed to be roughly comparable to Briar Cliff College in selected areas. The criteria upon which this similarity was determined is presented below in the rank order in which the items received attention.

a. Size
b. Four-year
c. Undergraduate programs only
d. Four-year programs only
e. Coeducational
f. Liberal Arts
g. Private
h. Degree offerings in physical education
i. Geographic location
j. Size of Community

Sixty-eight colleges were suggested for inclusion in the group of comparable colleges by various faculty and staff.

The sources of information for the college characteristics included:

a. 1969-70 College Facts Chart
b. September 1968 Accredited Institutions of Higher Education
c. Rand McNally Road Atlas 45th Annual Edition.

(NOTE: One source of error is the chronological differences in these publications.)

The following selected colleges were included in the sample population:

a. Coe College - Cedar Rapids, Iowa
b. St. Ambrose College - Davenport, Iowa
c. Gustavus Adolphus College - St. Peter, Minnesota
d. Sioux Falls College - Sioux Falls, South Dakota
e. Huron College - Huron, South Dakota
f. St. Mary of the Plains - Dodge City, Kansas
g. Dakota Wesleyan - Mitchell, South Dakota
h. Mount Marty College - Yankton, South Dakota
i. Yankton College - Yankton, South Dakota
j. Westmar College - LeMars, Iowa
k. Buena Vista College - Storm Lake, Iowa
l. Lawrence College - Appleton, Wisconsin
m. Dordt College - Sioux Center, Iowa
n. Grinnell College - Grinnell, Iowa
o. Augustana College - Sioux Falls, South Dakota

The questionnaire was sent to the director of physical education departments of the above mentioned institutions in an effort to ascertain the present status of workload for physical education personnel.

FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATION

The following ten institutions participated in the investigation for a 66.66% return:

Coe College - Cedar Rapids, Iowa
St. Ambrose College - Davenport, Iowa
Gustavus Adolphus College - St. Peter, Minnesota
Sioux Falls College - Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Huron College - Huron, South Dakota
St. Mary of the Plains - Dodge City, Kansas
Dakota Wesleyan College - Mitchell, South Dakota
Mount Marty College - Yankton, South Dakota
Westmar College -LeMars, Iowa
Buena Vista College - Storm Lake, Iowa

Ninety percent of the participants indicated that they desired to receive a copy of the tabulation of this investigation. Of the ten schools involved all currently utilize or plan to institute the 4-1-4 plan as the basic academic calendar.

In respect to the question regarding the existence of a policy regulating faculty workload ninety percent indicated that they did indeed, have a standard policy, although one department chairman did indicate that the policy at his institution was not followed. Eight out of the ten schools also had their faculty workload policies in written form.

Although all but one institution had policies supposedly determining workloads, only 50% of the department chairmen indicated that the workloads of faculty within the physical education department are determined in accordance with the general guidelines of all faculty. One-half of the schools assign workloads (responsibilities) on a basis other than that used by the majority of the departments.

From the list of the following factors which could be taken into consideration in the determination of faculty work load the respondents were asked to select those factors which enter in a significant manner in the determination of faculty workload in their own institutions. The responses

below reveal that only (a) credit hours taught, (b) coaching, (c) intramurals, and (d) administrative duties were selected by more than half of the institutions participating in the investigation.

a. credit hours taught	8 institutions
b. degree held	1 institution
c. teaching experience	no institutions
d. services (to school and/or community	4 institutions
e. number of students taught	3 institutions
f. research	no institutions
g. coaching	7 institutions
h. advising students	3 institutions
i. intramural involvement	6 institutions
j. extramurals involvement	5 institutions
k. cheerleader advisor	2 institutions
l. club or student organization advisor	4 institutions
m. committee work	1 institution
n. writing-publishing	no institutions
o. number of class preparations	2 institutions
p. level of course being offered - whether a freshman course or senior course offering	2 institutions
q. student contact hours	5 institutions
r. administrative duties	7 institutions
s. student-teaching supervision	3 institutions
t. recruiting athletes	1 institution

Faculty members who also fulfill coaching responsibilities receive additional compensation in seventy percent of the institutions while twenty percent of the schools do not provide for additional salary. Ten percent indicated that some coaches in the institution received extra pay while others do not.

Fifty percent of the institutions provide for a reduced workload for coaches, forty percent do not while ten percent indicated that while male coaches have a reduced workload, female coaches do not receive a reduction. Only ten percent of the schools indicated that athletic coaches receive additional salary as well as a reduced workload. In no institutions is there an athletic coach (full time) who is responsible for only coaching or athletic responsibilities.

In response to the question of "What is the average or usual teaching load of a member in the physical education department?" solicited the following responses:

a. 6-10 hours
b. 10 hours
c. 6-10 hours
d. 12-14 hours (5 hours credit for chairmanship or coach or athletic director)
e. 10-14 hours
f. 1-2 theory courses and 2 to 3 skill courses
g. 3 courses; fottball, basketball and track coaches teach only one-third load
h. 8-10 hours
i. 12 hours

Each institution has determined what constitutes an overload which range from more than 12 credit hours to more than 15 credit hours. Thirty percent of the department chairmen indicated that overloads are not assigned at any time. Compensation for overloads are non-existent in fifty percent of the institutions studied, ten percent have no predetermined method of compensation while ten percent indicated that an overload one semester would be coupled with a reduction in responsibility or workload in another semester.

The chart below depicts the responses to the question as to the approximate percentage of time the department chairmen spent in their various duties each week.

	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Total
a. teaching	30	35	20	20	33	50	10	25	15	80	31.8%
b. service		10	10			5				10	3.5%
c. research									15		1.5%
d. advising	10	5	15	10		5	10	10		5	7.0%
e. committee work			5	10		15	30	15	5		8.0%
f. coaching	10	30	10	30	33		40	40	25	4	22.2%
g. administrative duties	50	15	10	30	33	25	10	10	10	1	22.4%

It is interesting to note that teaching takes up the greatest percentage of the department chairman's time followed by both administrative duties and coaching.

A second question was provided to solicit information regarding the approximate time spent each week by the department chairman. There exists a significant discrepancy between the responses regarding percentages of time apent and the actual time spent each week by the chairman. Teaching required an average of 10.6 actual hours of time, service took 6.5 hours, research 1.5 hours, advising 3.5 hours, committee work 2.8 hours, coaching 13.4 hours and administrative duties 16.6 hours for an average total of 54.9 hours each week. Note that while the percentage of time allocated to the teaching act is 31.8% the actual time in hours devoted to teaching is 10.6. Administrative duties require the greatest number of hours of the chairman; yet this responsibility, when considered in light of the percentage of time allocated, ranks second to teaching. Coaching responsibilities required the second greatest number of hours per week but when compared with the percentages of time spent the coaching duties rank third behind teaching and administrative duties. One reason for these discrepancies might well be the fact that some department chairmen failed to complete both questions but rather chose only one, thus preventing an accurate comparison.

The chairmen were asked to select those factors which are ever considered a part of an individual physical education faculty member's total responsibility and assumed in addition (but without compensation) to the regular teaching assignments usually undertaken by all teaching personnel within the institution. The responses, in percentage terms, are provided below.

Responsibilities:	Respondents:
a. services to community	50%
b. research	10%
c. writing or publishing	20%
d. coaching	60%
e. advising students	60%

Responsibilities:	Respondents:
f. intramural supervision	50%
g. extramural supervision	40%
h. cheerleading	40%
i. club advisor	30%
j. committee	30%
k. student-teaching supervision.	20%
l. administrative duties	20%

The physical education department chairmen were asked if any of the department's personnel receive a reduced teaching load and/or additional salary compensation if the faculty member assumes any of the selected responsibilities. The following responses were tabulated:

Selected Responsibilities	Reduced Loan			Salary Increase		
	yes	no	no answer	yes	no	no answer
a. services to community	10%	80%	10%	10%	80%	10%
b. research	20%	70%	10%	10%	80%	10%
c. writing or publishing	20%	70%	10%	10%	80%	10%
d. coaching	70%	20%	10%	20%	70%	10%
e. advising students	10%	80%	10%	20%	80%	
f. intramurals supervision	50%	40%	10%	20%	70%	10%
g. extramurals supervision	20%	70%	10%	10%	80%	10%
h. cheerleading supervision	10%	80%	10%		90%	10%
i. club advisor		90%	10%		90%	10%
j. committee work	10%	80%	10%	10%	80%	10%
k. student-teaching supervision	40%	50%	10%	10%	80%	10%
l. administrative duties	60%	30%	10%	50%	40%	10%

While the above chart illustrates the status quo concerning compensation for selected responsibilities over and above teaching duties, the material tabulated below depicts the reactions of the chairmen as to the deisred situation should the chairmen be able to institute a new policy in respect to the topic of compensation for selected responsibilities.

Selected Responsibilities	Reduced Load			Salary Increase		
	yes	no	no answer	yes	no	no answer
a. service to community	10%	90%			70%	30%
b. research	40%	60%			70%	30%
c. writing or publishing	40%	60%		10%	60%	30%
d. coaching	90%	10%		40%	30%	30%
e. advising students	50%	50%		10%	60%	30%
f. intramural supervision	90%	10%		40%	30%	30%

Selected Responsibilities	Reduced Load			Salary Increase		
	yes	no	no answer	yes	no	no answer
g. extramural supervision	70%	30%		20%	50%	30%
h. cheerleading supervision	30%	70%		20%	50%	30%
i. club advisor	30%	70%			70%	30%
j. committee	50%	50%			70%	30%
k. Student-teaching supervisor	70%	30%		20%	50%	30%
l. administrative duties	90%	10%		50%	30%	20%

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings indicate a significant trend away from the traditional calendar employed on the small liberal arts campus and towards an academic atmosphere which will allow a greater degree of flexibility and independent searching.

It is interesting to note that while 80% of the schools solicited had written workload policies, 50% of the total institutions fail to employ the policy equally within all departments.

The lack of compensation for overloads in 50% of the institutions is certainly a practice which needs re-evaluation.

Teaching (credit hours taught) 31.8%, coaching(22.2%) and administrative duties (22.4%) receive the greatest percentage of the department chairman's time each week which coincides with the emphasis the institution places on various factors which are taken into consideration in assigning workload. The physical education faculty who engage in research and/or publishing, writing for professional journals is not recognized as having made a meaningful contribution in terms of faculty workload. The reason for the absence of writing and/or research in the small liberal arts college may well be the failure on behalf of the individual institution to recognize such efforts as an integral part of an individual's total workload.

There seems to be a significant difference between the actual policy and the department chairman's opinion as to the desired situation in respect to those responsibilities which merit a reduced load and/or a salary increase. Only 50% of the institutions currently provide for a reduced workload for intramural supervision, 90% of the chairmen indicated that they recommend a reduced workload. Only 20% of the schools allow reduced loads for extra-

murals while 70% of the chairmen found it desirable. Student-teaching supervisors were given a reduced load in 40% of the schools while the 70% department chairmen recommended such a policy be adopted.

It would seem that inconsistency is the watchword in respect to faculty workload. This investigator makes the following recommendations in respect to the determination of faculty workloads:

1) Each institution create a faculty workload policy
2) The policy should be written
3) The policy should be utilized consistently and equally within the institutions and within each department
4) The policy should be so devised so as to take into consideration all factors which actually make up the individual faculty members total responsibility
5) The policy should be so constructed and utilized as to weigh various types of teaching and non-teaching duties to gain a clearer perspective of the total responsibilities and workload of all faculty members
6) Overloads should not be assigned as a regular occurrence
7) Such factors as research, writing, committee work and advising students should receive recognition as part of the overall responsibility of the faculty member.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE RESPONSE RELATING TO LOAD WEIGHTING PRACTICES

Group	Written Faculty Load Weighting Policy	Use of Credit Hours	Use of Student Credit Hours	Use of Student Contact Hours	Use of Total Clock Hour Per Week	Use of Rank of Faculty Member	Use of Years of Service
Seven States Study (N = 82)	24.4	74.4	7.4	31.7	11.0	6.1	4.9
Remaining States (= 66)	34.8	62.3	6.1	40.9	16.6	6.1	3.0
Total Study (N = 148)	29.4	69.6	6.7	35.8	13.5	6.7	4.0
State College * (N = 34)	50.0	76.5	5.9	35.1	14.7	2.9	0
Universities * (N = 60)	28.3	58.5	8.3	41.8	20.0	12.0	6.6

* The totals presented for the state colleges and universities are sum totals for these two divisions, presented in this manner for interpretation and analysis, and are included in the total represented in the total study column.

TABLE II

GUIDE FOR FACULTY LOAD ASSIGNMENTS

I. It is recommended that each school and division adopt this unit system and that 40 units be considered as a full load for each faculty member per semester.

II. Instructional units are to be assigned according to the following formula:

a. Laboratory and activity classes	- 2 units for each clock hour per week in class
b. Undergraduate theory classes	- 3 units for each clock hour per week in class
c. Graduate classes	- 4 units for each clock hour per week in class
d. Student teaching supervision	- 2 units for each student assigned when the faculty member is also responsible for conducting practicum 1.75 for each student assigned when the faculty member is not responsible for practicum
e. Thesis and research report advising	- 1 unit for each student who is involved in a research report and no more than 2 units for each thesis advisee. (The decision on 1 or 2 units for thesis is at the discretion of the school or division.)
f. Independent Study	- 1 to 1.5 units for each student. (The decision is at the discretion of the school or division.)
g. Clinics	- 1 unit per clock hour per week assigned (example: 2 clock hours a week for a semester would equal 2 units)
h. Large lecture sections	- The unit value normally given for the class is to be doubled. It is further recommended that a graduate assistant be assigned to assist the instructor.

III. Special College assignments (class advising, club sponsors, coaching, directing plays, committee assignments, research, etc.) - 1 unit per clock hour per week.It is anticipated that the clock hours per week will be based on a semester average. The number of units to be assigned for research conducted by faculty members will be determined in accordance with the guidelines being developed for the college and criteria established by committees within schools and divisions.

Table II continued

IV. Administrative and coordinating Assignments

a. Deans and directors of schools and divisions	- 30 to 40 units
b. Associate deans, assistant deans, assistants to the dean	- 20 to 30 units
c. Department chairmen	- 10 to 25 units
d. Coordinators	- 1 unit per clock hour per week

It is recognized that assignments and responsibilities will vary in the various schools and divisions. Consequently, the suggested range is given to permit each school and division to establish the appropriate load value for each position. It is recommended that the formula of one unit for each clock hour per week (based on a semester average) necessary to perform the duties of the position be assigned.

TABLE III

WORKLOAD OF FACULTY

Semester	Number of Faculty	Units of Work	Average Load
Fall 1967	49	2,089	42.6
Spring 1968	50	2,123	42.4
Fall 1968	57 3/5	2,374	41.2
Spring 1969	59	2,425	41.3

TABLE IV

UNIT ASSIGNMENT BY DUTY

Dean of School	36
Associate dean of graduate studies	25
Assistant to the dean	25
Chairman, Department of Physical Education	20
Chairman, Department of Health Education	15
Director of athletics	35
Assistant to the director of athletics	25
Coordinator of women's activities	10
Coordinator of student teaching	10
Coordinator of men's intramurals	8
Director of WAA	6
Supervisor of WAA	4
Director of WIAP	12
Course Coordinator of elementary physical education	2
Course coordinator of dance	2
Course coordinator of non-majors	2
Course coordinator of safety education	6
Admissions Committee (four each-one male, one female)	8
Graduate laboratory director	4
Coordinator of demonstration school	30
Varsity Club	1
Scuba Club	1
Friars	1
Karate	1
Valkyrie club	2
Theatre dance group	4
Ballet club	2
Dance club	2
Folk dance club	2
Synchronized swimming	4
Majors club (two faculty @ two units each)	4

Coaching (Men)	Fall	Spring
Cross country, head	10	
Cross country, freshman	8	
Football, Head	20	10
Football, Assistant (3)	15	5
Football, freshman (2)	15	
Soccer, head	20	
Soccer, assistant	15	
Soccer, freshman (2)	10	
Basketball, head	15	15
Basketball, freshman	10	10
Swimming, head	10	10
Swimming, Assistant (2)	8	8

Table IV continued

Coaching (Men)	Fall	Spring
Wrestling, head	10	10
Wrestling, Assistant	8	8
Wrestling, freshman	8	8
Gymnastics, head	10	10
Gymnastics, assistant	8	8
Baseball, assistant		15
Baseball, freshman (2)		10
Golf, head		10
Golf, freshman		8
Tennis, head	6	10
Tennis, freshman	4	8
Track, head	10	15
Track, freshman	8	8
Track, assistant freshman	6	8
Trainer, head	20	15
Trainer, assistant	15	15
Trainer, freshman	10	10
Coaching (Women)		
Hockey, head	10	
Hockey, assistant	8	
Gymnastics	10	10
Swimming, head	8	8
Swimming, assistant	5	5
Basketball, head	8	8
Basketball, Assistant	6	6
Badminton		6
Bowling		6
Lacrosse, head		10
Lacross, assistant		5
Tennis		10
Softball		6
Archery		5
Trainer	8	8

TABLE V

Attached is a copy of the Faculty Work Evaluation Form. Will you answer the questions regarding your teaching load and other activities for the Fall term, 1970. In reporting class sizes, list the number of students enrolled in each class as of the end of the fourth week, October 2. The completed form should be submitted to the department head for his review and submission to the Dean's Office by October 9.

The few directions below may be helpful in completing the form:

1. Column 3. Class preparations will ordinarily be 4 for a unit course.

2. Column 5. For science and art courses with laboratory sections, count one hour for each hour of lecture and 2/3 hour for each contact hour of laboratory; for P.E. activity courses, private music lessons and musical groups (choir, etc.), count 2/3 hour for each contact hour. Convert this figure to units.

3. Column 7. This column will be used mainly by those who combine classroom teaching with other responsibilities, such as track coach or director of major plays. Committee assignments are not considered a part of one's load but should be listed in the space provided.

4. Column 8. To determine the number of student contact hours, multiply the number of students listed in Column 6 by the number of units listed in Column 5; then multiply this figure by 4 (to convert to hours).

5. Column 9. The usual figure here will be three units, the desired teaching load. To figure your full load, add the figure in Column 5 and the Figure, if any, in Column 7.

6. List separately all sections of a single course. Lumping them together gives an inaccurate and misleading figure in student contact hours (column number 8).

7. Laboratories or activity classes held concurrently will count as one.

TABLE V (continued)

FACULTY WORK EVALUATION SHEET

Name _____ Department _____ Term _____

Course Number	Course Title or Activity	Number of Different Class preparations per week	Student Credit in Units	Teaching Load in Units	Number of Students	Non-teaching Load in Units	Student Contact Hours	Col.5-Col.7 Teaching Load in Units

NON-TEACHING LOAD: List here such responsibilities as coach of a major or minor sport; director of a major college play, intramurals, forensics, honors program, etc.

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

OTHER COLLEGE-RELATED ACTIVITIES: Counseling, administrative duties, committees, advisor to student groups, research writing, chapel program coordinator, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____